



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,144	09/20/2002	Frank F. Chang	56.0630	2763

27452 7590 09/21/2005

SCHLUMBERGER TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION
IP DEPT., WELL STIMULATION
110 SCHLUMBERGER DRIVE, MD1
SUGAR LAND, TX 77478

EXAMINER

TUCKER, PHILIP C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1712

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/065,144

Applicant(s)

CHANG ET AL

Examiner

Philip C. Tucker

Art Unit

1712

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 8-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 8-15 and 17 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 16 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-3 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 1 teaches an organic acid at a concentration "greater than about 12%". This would be inclusive of concentrations of up to 100%. Applicants specification only provide support for a maximum of 28%. Furthermore, there is no support for the specific data point of 12%. Such is not supported by the teachings of applicants specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1712

1. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahayanake (6258859).

Dahayanake teaches a composition for treating subterranean formations which comprises a surfactant such as an alkylamidopropyl betaine and an acid (see abstract), wherein the surfactant is included in similar amounts (column 6, lines 22-30). The acid is present in amounts up to "about 10%", which is inclusive of greater than about 12%. Dahayanake teaches that the alkyl group may be erucyl (column 4, lines 1-6). Dahayanake differs from the present invention in that a specific example of the use of erucylamidopropyl betaine is not disclosed. It would however be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize erucylamidopropyl betaine in the invention of Dahayanake, given the teaching of Dahayanake that that alkylamidopropyl betaines, including the erucyl type, are useful in forming a composition for treating subterranean formations.

2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Lungwitz (2002/0033260).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject

Art Unit: 1712

matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2). Lungwitz teaches a well treatment fluid which comprises a betaine, and an acid within the scope of the present invention (see paragraph 0049). HEIDA is an organic acid. The chloride acid is the same as hydrochloric acid. The formula taught in claim 12 is inclusive of erucylamidopropyl betaine. Lungwitz differs in that a specific example of the use of erucylamidopropyl betaine is not disclosed. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize homologues of the BET-O-30 taught by Lungwitz, such as erucylamidopropyl betaine in the well fluid therein, since homologues with such similar structures would be expected to have similar utility, and further in view of this compound being encompassed by the formula in claim 12.

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Brady (6569814).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2). Brady teaches a well treatment fluid which comprises a betaine, and an acid within the scope of the present invention (see claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 11). Organic acids are taught in claim 2. Inorganic and organic acids are taught in claim 7. The formula taught in claim 1 is inclusive of erucylamidopropyl betaine. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize various compounds of the formula in claim 1 taught by Brady, such as erucylamidopropyl betaine in the well fluid therein, given the teaching of Brady that such are useful as viscoelastic surfactants in making the well fluid therein.

4. Claims 4, 8-15 and 17 are allowable over the art of record.

5. Applicant's amendment and arguments have been considered but are not deemed fully persuasive. The terminal disclaimers have overcome the double patenting rejections. Applicant's arguments with respect to Dahayanake are not deemed fully persuasive. The teaching of "about 10%" clearly encompasses the "greater than about 12%" of the current claims (In re DeVaney 88 USPQ 97, In re Ayers 69 USPQ 109). Although Dahayanake teaches a preferred range that may include "about 8%", such is not used to exclude the "about 10%", also taught therein. The rejection is thus maintained.

With respect to claim 4, the utility of methanol at the prescribed levels is not seen to be taught or suggested by Dahanayake, since no specific levels of isopropanol are taught therein. New rejections are presented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C. Tucker whose telephone number is 571-272-1095. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, Flexible schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1712

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Philip C Tucker
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1712

PCT-3851